

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/017,534	10/18/2001	Isaac Ostrovsky	265/222	8068	
34313 75	590 06/02/2004		EXAMINER		
	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP 4 PARK PLAZA		CONNOLLY	CONNOLLY, PATRICK J	
SUITE 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA	92614-2558		2877		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	·.		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/017,534 OSTROVSKY ET /		L. (M
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick J Connolly	2877	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cover she tw	ith the correspond nc address -	·-
THE REPLY FILED 29 <sup>th</sup> April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Ap Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of thi : (1) a timely filed amendm peal (with appeal fee); or (3	is application. A proper reply to ent which places the application	a n in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or	b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of experiod of e	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set or than SIX MONTHS from the mailing AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH and the date on which the petition under 3	ng date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MP 7 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate exten	PEP
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte			

(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any

(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the

1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

issues for appeal; and/or (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_ 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_ 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8.  $\square$  The drawing correction filed on is a)  $\square$  approved or b)  $\square$  disapproved by the Examiner. 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10. Other: \_\_

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below):

Samuel A. Turner Primary Examiner

## Continuation Sh et (PTOL-303) 10/017,534

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claims still contain alternative language that renders them unclear and fails to distinguish them from prior art. An example of this alternative language can be found in claim 1, lines 7 and 10 wherein the phrasing "at least one of" the reference beam and reflected sample beam is used. This does not distinguish which beam is to be diffracted such that either or both could be diffracted by the grating. The Zeylikovich reference teaches diffracting both beams.